

1
2
3
4 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 JANE DOE,

No. C 07-05596 SI

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S RECENT
DISCOVERY REQUESTS
[Docket Nos. 272, 273, 277]**

10 CITY OF SAN MATEO, et al.,

11 Defendants.
_____ /

12
13 Plaintiff has filed a motion seeking an order stating that plaintiff is entitled to litigate the issue
14 of whether she was too intoxicated to consent to sexual intercourse on the night of November 5, 2005.
15 Plaintiff's request is essentially for an advisory opinion about the scope of permissible discovery in this
16 case. This Court cannot provide advisory opinions. *See Siskiyou Regional Educ. Project v. U.S. Forest*
17 *Service*, 565 F.3d 545, 559 (9th Cir. 2009) (citations omitted). The correct procedure is for plaintiff to
18 request discovery from defendants and file a letter brief with this Court if she is unable to resolve any
19 disputes through the meet and confer process. Accordingly, plaintiff's "motion for clarification" is
20 DENIED. [Docket Nos. 272, 277]

21 Plaintiff has also filed a motion to compel the County of San Mateo to produce the names of the
22 sheriff's deputies who were assigned to plaintiff's jail cell on the night of November 5, 2005. [Docket
23 No. 273] Per this Court's standing order, defendant's response was due on June 22, 2009. The County
24 of San Mateo is directed to file a response without further delay **and no later than June 25, 2009.**

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26 Dated: June 24, 2009



27 SUSAN ILLSTON
28 United States District Judge